

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/534,282	GUNSEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin M Bernatz	1773	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin M Bernatz.

(3) Benjamin Bai.

(2) Steven Resan.

(4) Janet Garett.

Date of Interview: 24 May 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ng and Venier.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants argued that "derivatives" is not indefinite, but agreed to entertain idea of taking out the word in the interest of clarity. Issues regarding wording of 102 claims discussed and clarified. Applicants argued that Ng was not encompassed by their claims and that fluorinated groups were excluded in their invention, though claim 9 clearly shows fluorinated end groups as being within the scope of applicants' invention. Applicants were informed that Ng appeared to be the closest prior art for the case of unexpected results. Applicants mentioned they may consider directing the invention exclusively to "hydrocarbon substituted" instead of the current claimed limitations.